

CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS
Amanda Seabock, Esq., SBN 289900
Prathima Price, Esq., SBN 321378
Dennis Price, Esq., SBN 279082
Mail: 8033 Linda Vista Road, Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92111
(858) 375-7385; (888) 422-5191 fax
amandas@potterhandy.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Scott Johnson

Plaintiff,

v.

John Chung-Kai Chan, in
individual and representative
capacity as trustee of The John
Chung-Kai Chan Irrevocable Trust
dated December 19, 2012;

Blind Tasting, LLC, a California
Limited Liability Company

Defendants.

Case No.

**Complaint For Damages And
Injunctive Relief For Violations
Of: Americans With Disabilities
Act; Unruh Civil Rights Act**

Plaintiff Scott Johnson complains of John Chung-Kai Chan, in individual and representative capacity as trustee of The John Chung-Kai Chan Irrevocable Trust dated December 19, 2012; Blind Tasting, LLC, a California Limited Liability Company; and alleges as follows:

PARTIES:

1. Plaintiff is a California resident with physical disabilities. Plaintiff is a

1 level C-5 quadriplegic. He cannot walk and also has significant manual
2 dexterity impairments. He uses a wheelchair for mobility and has a specially
3 equipped van.

4 2. Defendant John Chung-Kai Chan, in individual and representative
5 capacity as trustee of The John Chung-Kai Chan Irrevocable Trust dated
6 December 19, 2012, owned the real property located at or about 749 Laurel
7 St, San Carlos, California, in March 2021 and April 2021.

8 3. Defendant John Chung-Kai Chan, in individual and representative
9 capacity as trustee of The John Chung-Kai Chan Irrevocable Trust dated
10 December 19, 2012, owns the real property located at or about 749 Laurel St,
11 San Carlos, California, currently.

12 4. Defendant Blind Tasting, LLC owned Blind Tasting Beer and Wine Bar
13 located at or about 749 Laurel St, San Carlos, California, in March 2021 and
14 April 2021.

15 5. Defendant Blind Tasting, LLC owns Blind Tasting Beer and Wine Bar
16 located at or about 749 Laurel St, San Carlos, California, currently.

17 6. Plaintiff does not know the true names of Defendants, their business
18 capacities, their ownership connection to the property and business, or their
19 relative responsibilities in causing the access violations herein complained of,
20 and alleges a joint venture and common enterprise by all such Defendants.
21 Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the Defendants herein is
22 responsible in some capacity for the events herein alleged, or is a necessary
23 party for obtaining appropriate relief. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend when
24 the true names, capacities, connections, and responsibilities of the Defendants
25 are ascertained.

26
27 **JURISDICTION & VENUE:**

28 7. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the action pursuant to 28

1 U.S.C. § 1331 and § 1343(a)(3) & (a)(4) for violations of the Americans with
2 Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq.

3 8. Pursuant to supplemental jurisdiction, an attendant and related cause
4 of action, arising from the same nucleus of operative facts and arising out of
5 the same transactions, is also brought under California's Unruh Civil Rights
6 Act, which act expressly incorporates the Americans with Disabilities Act.

7 9. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and is
8 founded on the fact that the real property which is the subject of this action is
9 located in this district and that Plaintiff's cause of action arose in this district.

10
11 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS:**

12 10. Plaintiff went to Blind Tasting Beer and Wine Bar in March 2021 with
13 the intention to avail himself of its goods or services motivated in part to
14 determine if the defendants comply with the disability access laws. Not only
15 did Plaintiff personally encounter the unlawful barriers in March 2021, but he
16 wanted to return and patronize the business several times but was specifically
17 deterred due to his actual personal knowledge of the barriers gleaned from his
18 encounter with them.

19 11. Blind Tasting Beer and Wine Bar is a facility open to the public, a place
20 of public accommodation, and a business establishment.

21 12. Unfortunately, on the date of the plaintiff's visit, the defendants failed
22 to provide wheelchair accessible outside dining surfaces in conformance with
23 the ADA Standards as it relates to wheelchair users like the plaintiff.

24 13. Blind Tasting Beer and Wine Bar provides dining surfaces to its
25 customers but fails to provide any wheelchair accessible outside dining
26 surfaces.

27 14. One problem that plaintiff encountered was the lack of sufficient knee
28 or toe clearance under the outside dining surfaces for wheelchair users.

1 15. Plaintiff believes that there are other features of the dining surfaces that
2 likely fail to comply with the ADA Standards and seeks to have fully compliant
3 dining surfaces for wheelchair users.

4 16. On information and belief, the defendants currently fail to provide
5 wheelchair accessible dining surfaces.

6 17. These barriers relate to and impact the plaintiff's disability. Plaintiff
7 personally encountered these barriers.

8 18. As a wheelchair user, the plaintiff benefits from and is entitled to use
9 wheelchair accessible facilities. By failing to provide accessible facilities, the
10 defendants denied the plaintiff full and equal access.

11 19. The failure to provide accessible facilities created difficulty and
12 discomfort for the Plaintiff.

13 20. Even though the plaintiff did not confront the following barriers, the
14 restroom mirror and coat hook are too high. The plumbing underneath the sink
15 is not wrapped to protect against burning contact. Plaintiff seeks to have these
16 barriers removed as they relate to and impact his disability.

17 21. The defendants have failed to maintain in working and useable
18 conditions those features required to provide ready access to persons with
19 disabilities.

20 22. The barriers identified above are easily removed without much
21 difficulty or expense. They are the types of barriers identified by the
22 Department of Justice as presumably readily achievable to remove and, in fact,
23 these barriers are readily achievable to remove. Moreover, there are numerous
24 alternative accommodations that could be made to provide a greater level of
25 access if complete removal were not achievable.

26 23. Plaintiff will return to Blind Tasting Beer and Wine Bar to avail himself
27 of its goods or services and to determine compliance with the disability access
28 laws once it is represented to him that Blind Tasting Beer and Wine Bar and its

1 facilities are accessible. Plaintiff is currently deterred from doing so because
 2 of his knowledge of the existing barriers and his uncertainty about the
 3 existence of yet other barriers on the site. If the barriers are not removed, the
 4 plaintiff will face unlawful and discriminatory barriers again.

5 24. Given the obvious and blatant nature of the barriers and violations
 6 alleged herein, the plaintiff alleges, on information and belief, that there are
 7 other violations and barriers on the site that relate to his disability. Plaintiff will
 8 amend the complaint, to provide proper notice regarding the scope of this
 9 lawsuit, once he conducts a site inspection. However, please be on notice that
 10 the plaintiff seeks to have all barriers related to his disability remedied. See
 11 *Doran v. 7-11*, 524 F.3d 1034 (9th Cir. 2008) (holding that once a plaintiff
 12 encounters one barrier at a site, he can sue to have all barriers that relate to his
 13 disability removed regardless of whether he personally encountered them).
 14

15 **I. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS**
 16 **WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990** (On behalf of Plaintiff and against all
 17 Defendants.) (42 U.S.C. section 12101, et seq.)

18 25. Plaintiff re-pleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth
 19 again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this
 20 complaint.

21 26. Under the ADA, it is an act of discrimination to fail to ensure that the
 22 privileges, advantages, accommodations, facilities, goods and services of any
 23 place of public accommodation is offered on a full and equal basis by anyone
 24 who owns, leases, or operates a place of public accommodation. See 42 U.S.C.
 25 § 12182(a). Discrimination is defined, inter alia, as follows:

- 26 a. A failure to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices,
 27 or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford
 28 goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or

1 accommodations to individuals with disabilities, unless the
 2 accommodation would work a fundamental alteration of those
 3 services and facilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii).

4 b. A failure to remove architectural barriers where such removal is
 5 readily achievable. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv). Barriers are
 6 defined by reference to the ADA Standards.

7 c. A failure to make alterations in such a manner that, to the
 8 maximum extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility are
 9 readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities,
 10 including individuals who use wheelchairs or to ensure that, to the
 11 maximum extent feasible, the path of travel to the altered area and
 12 the bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving the
 13 altered area, are readily accessible to and usable by individuals
 14 with disabilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2).

15 27. When a business provides dining surfaces, it must provide accessible
 16 dining surfaces.

17 28. Here, accessible dining surfaces have not been provided in
 18 conformance with the ADA Standards.

19 29. When a business provides restrooms, it must provide accessible
 20 restrooms.

21 30. Here, accessible restrooms have not been provided in conformance with
 22 the ADA Standards.

23 31. The Safe Harbor provisions of the 2010 Standards are not applicable
 24 here because the conditions challenged in this lawsuit do not comply with the
 25 1991 Standards.

26 32. A public accommodation must maintain in operable working condition
 27 those features of its facilities and equipment that are required to be readily
 28 accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities. 28 C.F.R. § 36.211(a).

33. Here, the failure to ensure that the accessible facilities were available and ready to be used by the plaintiff is a violation of the law.

II. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE UNRUH CIVIL RIGHTS ACT (On behalf of Plaintiff and against all Defendants.) (Cal. Civ. Code § 51-53.)

34. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this complaint. The Unruh Civil Rights Act (“Unruh Act”) guarantees, inter alia, that persons with disabilities are entitled to full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges, or services in all business establishment of every kind whatsoever within the jurisdiction of the State of California. Cal. Civ. Code § 51(b).

35. The Unruh Act provides that a violation of the ADA is a violation of the Unruh Act. Cal. Civ. Code, § 51(f).

36. Defendants’ acts and omissions, as herein alleged, have violated the Unruh Act by, inter alia, denying, or aiding, or inciting the denial of, Plaintiff’s rights to full and equal use of the accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges, or services offered.

37. Because the violation of the Unruh Civil Rights Act resulted in difficulty, discomfort or embarrassment for the plaintiff, the defendants are also each responsible for statutory damages, i.e., a civil penalty. (Civ. Code § 55.56(a)-(c).)

38. Although the plaintiff encountered frustration and difficulty by facing discriminatory barriers, even manifesting itself with minor and fleeting physical symptoms, the plaintiff does not value this very modest physical personal injury greater than the amount of the statutory damages.

PRAYER:

Wherefore, Plaintiff prays that this Court award damages and provide relief as follows:

1. For injunctive relief, compelling Defendants to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Unruh Civil Rights Act. Note: the plaintiff is not invoking section 55 of the California Civil Code and is not seeking injunctive relief under the Disabled Persons Act at all.

2. For equitable nominal damages for violation of the ADA. See *Uzuegbunam v. Preczewski*, --- U.S. ---, 2021 WL 850106 (U.S. Mar. 8, 2021) and any other equitable relief the Court sees fit to grant.

3. Damages under the Unruh Civil Rights Act, which provides for actual damages and a statutory minimum of \$4,000 for each offense.

4. Reasonable attorney fees, litigation expenses and costs of suit, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12205; and Cal. Civ. Code §§ 52.

Dated: May 25, 2021

CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS

By: _____



Amanda Seabock, Esq.
Attorney for plaintiff